

Project Acronym: OCRIS

Version: 1

Contact: g.dunsire@strath.ac.uk; klmenzies@cis.strath.ac.uk

Date: 30th April, 2009



JISC Project Plan

Overview of Project

1. Background

Crucial questions about how and why we should achieve interoperability between institutional repositories (IRs) and online public access catalogues (OPACs) have been overshadowed, to some extent, by the rich but fractured discourse around repository and catalogue building, which seems to have split into two discrete seams of dialogue. Given that all University libraries in the UK possess OPACS, and that 83 currently have at least one IR (with others doubtless planned within some, if not most, of the remainder), it is time that clear, solid recommendations, on how to marry the in-scope content of the IR with the functionality of the traditional library OPAC, be formulated and disseminated to relevant stakeholders. This is why JISC's Scholarly Communications Group have commissioned the "Online Catalogue and Repository Interoperability Study" (OCRIS), a 3 month project incorporating a survey of higher education institutions (HEIs) and a close analysis of the technical implementations and workflows involved in running and "linking" OPACs and IRs. The project has a strong focus on "future-proofing"; exploring how interoperability of systems might assist with the preservation, visibility and utility of institutions' intellectual outputs.

Although there may be confusion over what exactly an IR is and what its scope should be, the OPAC is well-established; logic dictates that many OPACs will *already* hold metadata related to in-scope repository content, and ultimately, both systems have many common functionalities. IRs should theoretically supplement the library OPAC, traditionally used for the dissemination of publications associated with the library's parent institution. If a "secure central archive for digital publications [is] essential to ensuring that today's research findings are not lost to the future" the OPAC can clearly play a part. However, links must exist between them and IRs if this is to be achieved and if useful services are to stem from such an archive. Issues of metadata quality and standardisation are vital here, as is the development of clearly focussed technical and managerial guidelines and workflows, at the prior-to-development stages of IR building.

There are a number of services which might stem from allowing OPACs and IRs to interoperate. For example, an internal auditor or an external assessment agency might find out about an institution's research output; a member of staff might use the institution's various catalogues to compile research assessment (e.g. RAE/REF) returns or to answer a query from a research funder concerning access to publications resulting from research funded by them; comprehensive publications lists for a particular author or subject area, for use within a taught course, could be compiled, as could a range of other datasets such as statistics. However, if items are essentially "siloes" in separate systems that do not "communicate" with one another, these cannot be expected or achieved. Application and information integration must be guaranteed, with syntactic, semantic, and numeric interoperability secured.

Developing useful services should be done with a clear understanding of the technical, economic, socio-political and strategic issues involved in any given HEI and across HEIs as a group. It must also be done in consultation with – and with a clear understanding of – the range of stakeholders with an interest in the present and future of the institution. This includes teaching staff, researchers, Systems Librarians, Repository Managers, Human Resources and other administrative personnel and departments.

It is likely that there will be a role in the interoperable HEI for emergent tools and technologies such as "vertical search" services, "add-ons" which help users enter metadata consistently and correctly, and for service oriented architectures (SOAs), which can improve system communication and thus resource discovery. This then leads to discussions about what the wider ramifications of interoperability in an online world moving toward the "Semantic Web", "Web 3", and resources

Project Acronym: OCRIS

Version: 1

Contact: g.dunsire@strath.ac.uk; klmenzies@cis.strath.ac.uk

Date: 30th April, 2009

distributed between internal and external sources might be. Business intelligence (BI) methods should clearly also be considered at system level.

JISC have been interested in these subjects for some time, having commissioned a number of relevant studies, including "Linking institutional repositories" (Swan and Ayre, 2006), the "JISC & SCONUL library management systems Study" (2008), and the "Towards implementation of Library 2.0 and the e-Framework" (TILE) project. The work of CRIG has also considered these issues. Recent investigations into the implications of the new Research Excellence Framework (REF) such as the JISC support project for HEFCE's "REF bibliometrics pilot exercise" (HEFCE, 2008) also provide much relevant information on HEI systems and policy.

The Centre for Digital Library Research (CDLR) has worked on several projects in the past related to IRs, OPACs, or both; primarily Managing digital assets in tertiary education (Mandate), Harvesting institutional resources in Scotland testbed (HalRST), Institutional repository infrastructure for Scotland (IRIScotland) and OAI Scotland information service: open archives and access initiatives in Scotland (OAISIS). We are also involved in ongoing work with Strathprints (the University of Strathclyde's IR) and the High level thesaurus (HILT) project, and have advocated linking IRs to other institutional systems for some time. The crucial issue of metadata quality and resource description in a digital environment (e.g. through the use of schemas and ontologies) is something which the CDLR is well qualified to pass comment on, with members of staff heavily involved with a number of relevant groups including the Resource Description and Access (RDA) Outreach Group and the Dublin Core Metadata Initiative (DCMI) RDA Task Group.

2. Aims and Objectives

- Survey the extent to which repository content is in scope for institutional library OPACs, and the extent to which it is already recorded there.
- Examine the interoperability of OPAC and repository software for the exchange of metadata and other information.
- List the various services to institutional managers, researchers, teachers and learners offered respectively by OPACs and repositories.
- Identify the potential for improvements in the links (e.g. using link resolver technology) from repositories and/or OPACs to other institutional services, such as finance or research administration.
- Make recommendations for the development of possible further links between library OPACs and institutional repositories, identifying the benefits of such links to various stakeholder groups.

3. Overall Approach

OCRIS combines qualitative and quantitative research methods to carry out a survey of the HE IR and OPAC landscapes, gathering hard facts and figures, eliciting informed opinion, and asking about the interoperability and service-related "ideals" of a range of key stakeholders, in consultation with relevant experts and other professionals throughout.

Sampling undertaken will be purposive rather than random. The primary survey instruments used for the project are a questionnaire and two case studies, combined with desk research.

Work will be divided into 5 distinct Workpackages, each flowing logically into the next, with some overlap. Taken together, these will constitute a detailed description of UK HEIs, their OPACs, IRs, associated services, and developments and attitudes toward interoperability and integration.

Using internet-based desk research, drawing on existing knowledge of and contacts within UK HEIs and using directory services such as the Registry of open access repositories (ROAR) and the Directory of open access repositories (OpenDOAR), we will construct and carry out a questionnaire of UK HEIs (targeting particularly systems librarians, repository managers, finance, research co-ordination and human resources departments) to establish which IR software they use, which OPACs they use, which organisational unit is responsible for the repository, which services they currently offer to entities internal and external to the institution and whether or not they have considered issues regarding OPAC interoperability. This will be supplemented with extensive desk research.

Project Acronym: OCRIS

Version: 1

Contact: g.dunsire@strath.ac.uk; klmenzies@cis.strath.ac.uk

Date: 30th April, 2009

We have already interrogated ROAR and OpenDOAR to identify all HEIs within the UK which utilise both a library OPAC and at least one type of publicly accessible IR. Our survey will give us the chance to verify and add to this information (for example, detailed technical and other information may not be available openly, especially in the case of administrative systems).

The questionnaire will gather information about the scope/content types of each identified IR and OPAC, the level of access allowed to a repository, details of the metadata and standards used by each, current and desired services (primarily in terms of reporting), and the level of interoperation of current systems. Depending on response level, this approach allows for the compilation of as comprehensive and authoritative a list as possible, to be supplemented by a spreadsheet of details about HEI IRs and OPACs within UK HE, gained via desk research.

The OCRIS team will then identify those institutions with OPACs and IRs which, in terms of system architecture, syntax and semantics:

1. already interoperate,
2. might theoretically interoperate,
3. which definitely could not interoperate or integrate,

on each of the levels described above.

We will then test a representative, purposive sample of OPACs and IRs to provide illustrative figures and a useful snapshot of the current situation regarding duplication of both *records* and *scope* between these systems within UK HE. We will also consider at technical level whether and how these library-based systems interoperate with other institutional systems and determine what reports are currently generated and assess how useful the interfaces to the various systems are in terms of interoperability and standardisation.

Two case studies – within large research dominated HE libraries – provide us with the opportunity to observe and report on real world examples from which we can outline and analyse specific issues, workflows, and derive a set of usage scenarios of benefit to both stakeholders generally and to the case study libraries: the Cambridge University Library (University of Cambridge) and the Glasgow University Library (University of Glasgow). These case studies will occur in July 2009 (weeks 10 and 13 of the project).

Important issues to be addressed

The broader context in which IRs and OPACs exist within their parent institutions directly influences the ways in which they are implemented, organised and perceived; we must understand and analyse these systems at various “depths”, looking closely at fine detail (e.g. metadata quality) and more broadly, at the level of “policy” and “mission”. Important issues to be addressed are:

- Technical issues involved in the implementation and running of IRs and OPACs both discretely as a group and with regard to integration and interoperability.
- Metadata schemes and standards used within IRs and OPACs.
- Views of staff and users with regard to service development.
- Workflows and procedures currently governing development and use of IRs and OPACs, and how these might be improved upon or further developed.
- The socio-political and economic factors and imperatives informing the strategic aims and objectives of HEIs; how these affect collection policy, development policy, work practices and the attitudes of staff and other stakeholders.

Scope and boundaries of the work

Due to time and funding constraints, we will not be able to consider all UK HEIs. Although those HEIs currently possessing no IR may be planning to develop one, OCRIS will focus on those institutions which *already have at least one IR*, as this will allow us to gain understanding of actualities rather than hypotheticals. As stated above, this constitutes a purposive sample. Clearly those HEIs without IRs at present might gain valuable insights from the final outputs of the OCRIS project, making active, effective dissemination even more paramount. Considering the situation of these institutions in

Project Acronym: OCRIS

Version: 1

Contact: g.dunsire@strath.ac.uk; klmenzies@cis.strath.ac.uk

Date: 30th April, 2009

advance of our analysis is unlikely to be beneficial for either side, being highly time-consuming. By comparing the situations of Glasgow, where IR development has been extensive and ongoing for some time, and Cambridge, where this is less so, will allow us to generalise, to some extent, across the IR and IR/OPAC interoperability development cycles.

Again, due to the time and funding constraints of the project we will not be able to consider in depth the appropriateness of the full range of "Semantic Web" and associated tools and applications currently being discussed in relation to many OPACs and IRs. We can discuss these primarily in general terms, and illustratively. Through the case study at Cambridge – who will be in the midst of a tendering process for the implementation of such tools within their institution as OCRIS takes place - we should also be able to offer some specifics.

Having interpreted the terms stipulated in the ITT and having already undertaken some desk research, we have determined that in a few instances some types of "Institutional Repository" listed in online registries are not within the scope of this study. For instance, some HEIs have begun to hold content in IR software packages which might better be described as "digital libraries" or "research collections", including material not created within the institution. One example is the "First World War Poetry Archive" (<http://www.oucs.ox.ac.uk/ww1lit>) of the University of Oxford, listed in the OpenDoar Registry. Although clearly we should consider such examples in our discussion, we will not include the managers of these services in our list of survey contacts as these do not exclusively hold items or metadata relating to items produced by staff and students within the institution in question.

Included in our survey however will be two cross-institutional organisations and professional bodies focussed on research, with members and affiliates from within UK HEIs and who are in possession of discrete IRs: these are the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom and the Institute for Research and Innovation in Social Services. Both organisations' IRs hold many contributions from UK researchers from multiple institutions. As such, they will be treated as in scope; investigating such situations gives us a chance to provide JISC with valuable information on how interoperability of local systems might affect the forging of links with external ones.

Critical success factors will be:

- Obtaining a sufficient and informative response to the questionnaire deployed within Workpackage 1 and, as a corollary, via our desk research.
- Receiving the full co-operation of partners within the institutions acting as case studies, allowing us to analyse workflows and make recommendations based on actual practice and "real-world" situations.
- Forming an adequate understanding of the technical problems, limitations, and potentials of the current software and IT infrastructure used by/supporting the range of OPACs and IRs currently existing within UK HEIs. I.e., we will need to ensure that the project is underpinned by a sound technical understanding of the systems under consideration.
- Uptake by the community of the recommendations and the "Action Plan" produced by the OCRIS project within Workpackage 4.

4. Project Outputs

The "tangible" deliverables of OCRIS are as follows:

1. **D1.2** - A list of IRs and OPACs being used by UK HEIs, identifying those which do/do not/could theoretically interoperate/integrate.
2. **D1.3** - A list of services currently offered within HEIs deriving from IRs and OPACs and a list of services *desired* by those working with IRs and OPACs within said HEIs, and learners/teaching staff/researchers and other end-users.
3. **D2.1** - Analysis of a purposive sample of HEI IRs and OPACs which share or duplicate content.
4. **D3.1** - Case studies on the socio-political, technical and workflow related issues relating to IR and OPAC use and development within the libraries of the Universities of Glasgow and Cambridge.
5. **D4.2** - Final report and Action plan

Project Acronym: OCRIS

Version: 1

Contact: g.dunsire@strath.ac.uk; klmenzies@cis.strath.ac.uk

Date: 30th April, 2009

The “less tangible” knowledge and experience we intend to “build and share” will be:

- A knowledge of the way in which OPACs and IRs are viewed and discussed within individual libraries at research intensive institutions, as a result of our case studies at Glasgow and Cambridge.
- A deepened technical understanding of the issues involved in allowing OPACs and IRs to interoperate and in developing services as a result of this.
- An improved understanding of the motivations and concerns of a wide group of stakeholders, from institutional management level down, with regards to OPACs, IRs and administrative systems.
- Further project planning and management experience.

5. Project Outcomes

Outcomes will be applicable to a range of stakeholders and outcomes of direct benefit to each group include:

1. **JISC** – will receive a useful, re-purposable and value-for-money set of deliverables/outputs documenting comprehensively the key issues involved in the interoperability of OPACs, IRs, the services which could be developed from them, and the attitudes and ideals of a range of key stakeholders. They will also receive a clear, solid set of guidelines and recommendations on how best to proceed and the further work needing done in this area.
2. **Scholarly and research communities** – will gain insight into the benefits of allowing OPACs and IRs to interoperate as they relate to scholarly concerns and needs; for example, improving resource discovery and increasing the visibility of research outputs.
3. **University governance and management** – clarification on how to approach IRs and OPACs in relation to University strategy and how technical improvements and service development will further the aims and objectives of the institution. This will point towards efficiency gains, economies of scale, and better value for money.
4. **Librarians, archivists and related information professionals** - will gain insight into the benefits of allowing OPACs and IRs to interoperate as they relate to 1. Library workflows and meeting the key aims of their department/institution, and 2. Scholarly concerns and needs; primarily, improving resource discovery and increasing the visibility of research outputs. They will additionally benefit from being given the chance to input their thoughts and opinions directly into the OCRIS project via the survey conducted within Workpackage 1.
5. **Repository staff and the repository community** - the central position of IRs to the development of an institution will be further elaborated on and it is hoped that OCRIS will suggest ways in which this position can be strengthened via useful links to OPACs and other repository systems. Repository staff will benefit from the chance to input their thoughts and opinions directly into the project via the survey conducted within Workpackage 1.
6. **HE administrative staff (e.g. HR, Finance, R&D)** - OCRIS will recommend the development of services beneficial to the work of these departments. Such services would allow a mutually productive and more seamless cooperative relationship between these agencies and the HEIs which they deal with. They will benefit from the chance to input their thoughts and opinions into the project directly by being contacted as part of Workpackage 1.
7. **IT Staff** – will be directly involved in technical development of the systems with which they work (e.g. IR and LMS software) as a result of any actions arising from the OCRIS Final report and Action plan. It is hoped that these developments will not only be technically interesting but that they will improve efficiency and allow chances for collaborative work between IT staff across departments.
8. **External bodies (e.g. funding agencies)** – it is hoped that OCRIS will recommend the development of services beneficial to the work of external agencies, including, but not limited to, HEFCE as we move towards the REF. Such services would allow a mutually productive

and more seamless cooperative relationship between these agencies and the HEIs which they deal with.

9. **Students and learners** – if the recommendations produced by OCRIS are acted upon by UK HEIs, it is hoped that the student population (and other learners with access to the systems and services of the institution) will directly benefit from saved money, improved workflows, more effective and useful systems and services, and improved resource discovery.
10. **Groups and organisations affiliated or associated with HEIs (e.g. consortia and umbrella organisations possessing, or with an interest in, IRs and OPACs)** – such groups will be able to assist their members by disseminating useful OCRIS outputs to them. They can build on these and adapt to suit their own needs. They will also find HEI data easier to harvest and share via the developments made to relevant systems as a result of institutions following OCRIS' recommendations.

The OCRIS team hopes, by undertaking this work on behalf of JISC, to be one catalyst for change in the fundamental attitudes of stakeholders to the implementation and development of IRs and OPACs and for a strengthening of the role of libraries, librarians and their systems, which have always been at the heart of institutional life.

6. Stakeholder Analysis

Stakeholder	Interest/Stake	Importance
University governance and management	High	High
Research and Innovation, Finance, HR and internal auditing departments, administrative staff	High	High
External auditors and assessors	Medium	High
Researchers	High	High
Systems Librarians	High	High
Heads of Department	High	Medium
IR community	High	High
OPAC community	High	High
JISC services and projects	High	High
Students and learners	Medium	Medium

7. Risk Analysis

Risk	Probability (1-5)	Severity (1-5)	Score (PxS)(1-5)	Action to prevent/manage risk
Staff and organisational problems	1	4	4	Most staff associated with this proposal are currently in post and are available from the proposed start date. The CDLR have considerable project management experience.
Low response to questionnaire	2	3	6	We will endeavour to get a response sufficient to be representative of the wider population, and could make up for lack via desk research.
Institutions decide not to act as case studies	1	4	4	We already have agreement from the two proposed partners. If one of the two backed out we would hope to draw on contacts within the Andersonian library at Strathclyde and use them as a case study.

Project Resources

8. Project Partners

The Centre for Digital Library Research is the only JISC partner on the OCRIS project.

The Centre for Digital Library Research (CDLR) was set up in 1999 and began full operations in early 2000. Originally set up as a joint initiative by the Information Resources Directorate and what is now

Project Acronym: OCRIS

Version: 1

Contact: g.dunsire@strath.ac.uk; klmenzies@cis.strath.ac.uk

Date: 30th April, 2009

the Department of Computer and Information Sciences, it seeks to "combine theory with practice in innovative ways" and be a centre of research excellence in the area of distributed digital information and learning environments, it has significant experience and expertise in all of the following areas: Interoperability in distributed systems, terminologies and taxonomies, metadata, organisational processes; Digital curation and preservation; Web 2.0; the Semantic Web; Information environment landscaping; User interface design; Digitisation, Information retrieval; Collection-level description and associated metadata; Information policy; Quality assurance and evaluation; Distributed architectures; Standards.

9. Project Management

Dennis Nicholson (CDLR) will be responsible for overseeing the project, acting as an expert advisor as and when required. He will contribute 3 days to the project (approximately 1 for each month of its duration).

Gordon Dunsire will be the Principal Investigator on OCRIS, responsible for overall management and training of junior staff. He will ensure that all required terms and conditions are adhered to and that JISC is kept informed of progress through the monitoring and reporting structures. He will spend on average 1 day per week managing the project, with junior staff at CDLR reporting to him. He will also monitor the timely preparation and delivery of all project documentation.

Team Member	Role	Contact	Commitment
Dennis Nicholson	CDLR Director	d.m.nicholson@strath.ac.uk	0.01 FTE
Gordon Dunsire	CDLR Depute Director	g.dunsire@strath.ac.uk	0.04 FTE
Kathleen Menzies	Project officer	klmenzies@cis.strath.ac.uk	1.0 FTE
Duncan Birrell	Project assistant	dbirrell@cis.strath.ac.uk	0.7 FTE

Kathleen Menzies, a Research Assistant at the CDLR will work full time on the project and will act as Project Officer. She will undertake the following duties: liaising with the JISC Programme Manager, ensuring that time schedules are adhered to, keeping in contact with case study institutions, survey respondents and other relevant stakeholders, and allocating tasks to the Project Assistant, contributing a minimum of 60 days to the project.

Duncan Birrell, a Research Assistant at the CDLR working 4 days per week, will act as Project Assistant and administer day-to-day project work. His primary responsibility will be to assist the Project Manager by gathering contact data, administering the web survey, undertaking a literature review, helping in case studies and analysis, and assisting with the preparation of the final OCRIS project outputs.

10. Programme Support

Primarily we would like support from the Programme Manager as we begin to disseminate our findings and make our research visible and useful to the wider JISC, HE, research and other relevant communities. Help and guidance will be requested throughout the project as and when required. We have agreed that we will have monthly meetings with our Programme Manager, Ben Wynne, to keep him updated on our progress.

11. Budget

See Appendix A (withheld).

Detailed Project Planning

12. Workpackages

See Appendix B.

13. Evaluation Plan

This project has a short timescale and all evaluation will be formative.

Timing	Factor to Evaluate	Questions to Address	Method(s)	Measure of Success
N/A	Success of questionnaire	Did we get an adequate response? Did we ask the right questions?	Counting responses, comparing to projected deliverables; seeing how well the information informs literature review and other Workpackages	Above 50 per cent response rate; adequate representation across the three discrete groups being questioned; data allows us to compile comprehensive and illustrative lists of data which can stand alone or within future Workpackages and JISC projects.
N/A	Success of case studies	Did we learn enough about the workflows and practices in operation at the two libraries? Did they benefit from taking part?	Evaluation of case studies in relation to projected deliverables and Final Outputs; consultation with our contacts within these institutions	Post-project reporting from case study institution staff who feel positive developments have resulted from their involvement; uptake by the same of the OCRIS recommendations. The usefulness of the case studies for informing more generalised scenarios formulated in our Recommendations.
N/A	Robustness of Action Plan and Final Report	Did we address all the issues relevant to the project, expected by JISC and other stakeholders? Are the recommendations set out clearly?	Consultation with JISC; close scrutiny pre and post-publication; effective dissemination	Uptake within the community by range of stakeholders; actions taken by HEIs which directly stem from the advice and conclusions of the OCRIS report.

14. Quality Plan

Output					
Timing	Quality criteria	QA method(s)	Evidence of compliance	Quality responsibilities	Quality tools
Workpackage 1	Accuracy and comprehensiveness of gathered data and lists (D1.2 and D1.3).	The methodology is designed to be thorough. List will be checked by senior members of team.	List cross-checked for verification.	Project Manager; Research Assistant	n/a
Workpackage 1	Robust technical infrastructure underlying online questionnaire	Regular checking of back-end database; day to day maintenance; running test queries etc.	Software and digital content will conform to standards – MS Access DB (3 rd normalised form), T-SQL query and XHTML mark-up.	Principal Investigator	n/a
Workpackage 2	Sufficient technical understanding of issues under analysis (D2.1).	Draw on existing knowledge of project team in consultation with senior staff.	Approval by experienced members of the project team and recognised experts who are participating in our case studies.	Principal Investigator	n/a
Workpackage 3	Clear awareness of the needs and	Effective communication via	Approval by staff consulted within the	All project staff – communication	n/a

Project Acronym: OCRIS

Version: 1

Contact: g.dunsire@strath.ac.uk; klmenzies@cis.strath.ac.uk

Date: 30th April, 2009

	workflows of case study institutions	email, telephone calls and face to face meetings; effective synthesis of WP2 findings.	case study institutions.	primarily the Project Manager.	
Workpackage 4	Coherent, solid set of recommendations within Action Plan (D4.2).	A clear structure will be followed, dividing recommendations into general, specific, and as they relate to each of the distinct stakeholder groups.	Approval and acceptance by Programme Manager and JISC.	All project staff	n/a
Workpackage 5	Effective dissemination	JISC Programme Manager and other contacts in wider community consulted and updated throughout and after project.	Outputs such as papers and presentations will be visible and documented. Uptake will be checked at regular intervals.	Principal Investigator, Project Manager and JISC	n/a

To elaborate on the Quality Assurance methods which will be used for database maintenance and the creation of web pages for the OCRIS project website:

- Both of these will be created by, and hosted internally at, the CDLR.
- The creation of the MS Access 2007 database which acts as the backend for the online questionnaire and which allows questionnaire responses to be stored and processed will be carried out in line with normal quality assured content and metadata creation processes, via the implementation of a simple workflow already usefully employed by the CDLR for various other projects. This includes the application of controlled vocabularies, checks for internal consistency, etc.
- The development of web pages requires compliance with various standards (for example, XHTML 2.0 as recommended by the W3C), and with accessibility legislation; this compliance will be verified in-house ahead of the publication of web pages, with checks made against the W3C website and its guidelines and official CDLR and Strathclyde University documentation.

Project Acronym: OCRIS

Version: 1

Contact: g.dunsire@strath.ac.uk; klmenzies@cis.strath.ac.uk

Date: 30th April, 2009

Appendices

Appendix A. Project Budget

Withheld.

Project Acronym: OCRIS
 Version: 1
 Contact: g.dunsire@strath.ac.uk; klmenzies@cis.strath.ac.uk
 Date: 30th April, 2009

Appendix B: Workpackages

Project start date: 27th April, 2009
 Project completion date: 31st August 2009*
 Duration: 3 months (13 weeks) **

WORKPACKAGES	Week	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14+
1:	1, 2														
2:	1, 2														
3:	2, 3														
4:	3														
5:	Future														

*It has been agreed with the Programme Manager that an unpaid extension until the end of August might be necessary, deviating from our initial plan to finish on the 1st of August. This would accommodate certain issues arising from the CDLR's internal staff/budget related issues. This would also accommodate the timing issues arising from the fact that our case study at the Cambridge University Library is unlikely – due to availability – to take place until around Week 11 of the project, giving us more time to prepare and analyse what we find out as a result of our time at Cambridge. Dates given in this Gantt chart may factor in the likelihood of this extension.

**Week 14+ represents the period *after* the project officially ends, wherein we will disseminate our findings in accordance with the aims and objectives of Workpackage 5.

Project Acronym: OCRIS

Version: 1

Contact: g.dunsire@strath.ac.uk; klmenzies@cis.strath.ac.uk

Date: 30th April, 2009

Workpackage and activity	Earliest start date	Latest completion date	Outputs (clearly indicate deliverables & reports in bold)	Milestone	Responsibility
YEAR 1	27/04/2009	31/08/2009			
WORKPACKAGE 1:	27/04/2009	15/06/2009			
Objective: Administering an online questionnaire for list creation					
T1.1 Creation of online questionnaire; gathering email addresses for institutional contacts	27/04/2009	01/06/2009	Database backend underlying questionnaire, serving online form interface and storing results. Database records.		Principal Investigator
T1.2 Administering questionnaire	15/05/2009	08/06/2009	<i>Internal Document:</i> List of email contacts drawn from within 83 HEIs comprising head librarians, systems librarians, repository managers and personnel from administrative departments (e.g. Finance, HR, R&D).		Project Manager
T1.2 Compilation and analysis of results	22/05/2009	15/06/2009			All project staff
	27/04/2009	22/05/2009	D1.1 Project Plan		Project Manager
	15/05/2009	08/06/2009	D1.2 List of IRs and OPACs being used by UK HEIs, identifying those which do/do not/could theoretically interoperate/integrate		Project Manager
	15/05/2009	15/06/2009	D1.3 List of services currently offered within HEI deriving from IRs and OPACs		Project Manager

Project Acronym: OCRIS

Version: 1

Contact: g.dunsire@strath.ac.uk; klmenzies@cis.strath.ac.uk

Date: 30th April, 2009

WORKPACKAGE 2:		27/04/9009	08/07/2009			
Objective: Desk research, sampling and analysis						
T2.1	Desk research into specifics (technical and semantic etc.) of the IRs, systems and OPACS mentioned by survey respondents, also using information on institutional websites	27/04/2009	08/07/2009		<i>Internal document</i> – a literature review covering technical aspects of OPACs and IRs at both front and back end. To be synthesised within D2.1.	Project Manager
T2.2	Sampling of OPACs and IRs from all responding institutions to gain illustrative figures on 1) duplication of records and 2) duplication of scope where records could be shared	08/06/2009	08/07/09		<i>Internal document</i> - Sample set of records from OPACs and IRs within UK HEIs, and resulting comparison and analysis. To be synthesised within D2.1.	Project Manager
T2.3	Analysis of issues involved in duplication of records/scope	10/06/09	15/07/09			Principal Investigator
WORKPACKAGE 3:						
Objective: Case studies at two research intensive HEI libraries						
T3.1	Case study of situation at University of Glasgow	10/07/09	17/07/09			All project staff
T3.2	Case study of situation at University of Cambridge	20/07/09	26/07/09			All project staff
T3.3	Comparison of both case studies; relation to wider findings; derivation of workflow analyses	20/07/09	28/07/09			Project Manager
WORKPACKAGE 4:						
		15/07/09	28/07/09		D3.1 Report on case studies	Project Manager

Project Acronym: OCRIS

Version: 1

Contact: g.dunsire@strath.ac.uk; klimenzies@cis.strath.ac.uk

Date: 30th April, 2009

<u>Objective:</u> Conclusions, Recommendations and Final Report						
T4.1 Preparation of set of recommendations based on reading and analysis of all of the above	22/07/09	28/07/09				
T4.2 Start drafting Final Report and Action plan for WP5	01/08/09	17/08/09		D4.1 Draft Final Report and Action Plan		Project Manager
	22/07/09	31/08/09		D4.2 Final Report and Action Plan		Principal Investigator
WORKPACKAGE 5:						
<u>Objective:</u> Dissemination						
T5.1 Prepare articles, presentations and research papers	Mid 09/09	No end date				
	Mid 09/09	No end date		D5.1 Articles, presentations and research papers		All project staff